





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

09/586,575 06/02/2000	Jennifer Pencis		
	Jennier Pencis	1001-0130	6027
22120 7590 12/05/2003		EXAM	INER
ZAGORIN O'BRIEN & GRAHA	HO, THANG H		
7600B N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HV SUITE 350	v v .	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78731		2188 .	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	09/586,575	PENCIS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAN INO DATE of this communication and	Thang H Ho	2188			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
	Notabor 2002				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 C</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		resecution as to the morits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>l</i> Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3, 6-11, 13-15 and 17-20</u> is/are rejected.					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4,5,12 and 16</u> is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
Certified copies of the priority documents					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the prior application from the prior appli	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	,				
a) The translation of the foreign language pro	visional application has been rec	ceived.			
Attachment(s)	, , ,				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2188

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's amendment dated 10/14/2003. The applicant's remarks and amendment were considered with the results that follow.
- 2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1, 3 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghaffari et al. (USPN: 6,088,740) in view of Arimilli et al (USPN: 6,487,637), hereinafter Arimilli.

As per claims 1 and 19, Ghaffari teaches in figures 1 and 2 a computer system comprising a processor (121), an integrated circuit (270) receiving command information over a plurality of bit times comprising: a command queue (276) storing command information received into the integrated circuit (270) during consecutive bit times (e.g. column 5, lines 19-23 and column 11, lines 13 et seq.). Ghaffari also teaches the updating of a write pointer to repoint a write pointer to point to the previous command already stored in command queue allowing recovery of command to restart in event of an error (e.g. abstract, column 2, lines 37-44, and column 17 et seq.).

Art Unit: 2188

However, Ghaffari fails to teach the control logic responsive to a cancellation indication in the command information, indicating that the command is cancelled.

Arimilli teaches the control logic responsive to a cancellation indication in the command information, indicating that the command is cancelled to stop the execution of the speculative command and remove it from the queue, thereby speeding up the processing and improving system performance (e.g. Abstract, FIG. 5, column 4, lines 55-61 and column 5, lines 7-20).

Accordingly, it would have been prima facie obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system and method as taught by Ghaffari and include a control logic to process the cancellation of command within the command queue as taught by Arimilli for the purpose stated above. Furthermore, the repointing of the write pointer to point to the command already stored in the command queue would allow for the reclamation of command blocks and eliminate the need for compacting the command queue to remove the canceled commands. Thus, providing a contiguous command queue and better system performance.

As per claims 2, 13 and 14, the combination of Ghaffari and Arimilli discloses that the command is speculative read operation (Arimilli, Abstract, FIG. 6, column 5, lines 7-20).

As per claim 3, Ghaffari discloses the integrated circuit as recited in claim 1 wherein the command queue includes a plurality of FIFO buffers, each of the FIFO

Art Unit: 2188

buffers storing a segment of a received command and wherein a plurality of write pointers point to locations in respective FIFO buffers to store a next command segment, and wherein segments of a command in different FIFO buffers are received at different bit times (e.g. figure 9 and column 5, lines 19-33).

As per claim 6, Ghaffari discloses the integrated circuit as recited in claim 4 wherein each of the plurality of FIFOs has its respective write pointer decremented in consecutive clock intervals (e.g. column 11, lines 13 et seq.).

As per claims 7, 8 and 20, Ghaffari discloses a content counter indicating a number of commands stored in the command buffer (figure 9, element 916 and column 11, lines 13 et seq.) wherein the content counter is decremented as a result of the cancellation indication (figure 13, element 1342 and column 14, lines 20 et seq.).

As per claims 9, 10, 11, 15, 17 and 18, the claims encompass the same scope of invention as to that of claims 1, 3, 6, 6, 7 and 8, respectively, however the claims are drafted as method format rather than apparatus format, the claims are therefore rejected for the same reasons as being set forth above.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4, 5, 12 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2188

Page 5

Art Unit: 2188

Page 6

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/2003 with respect to Claims 1-20 are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Page 7

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Form PTO-892.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to (703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thang H Ho whose telephone number is 703-305-1888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 A.M. - 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 703-306-2903. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Thang Ho Art Unit 2188 December 1, 2003 Kevin L. Ellis Primary Examiner

No. 1. 206